

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 812

EA 014 296

AUTHOR Cooper, Constance Carter
TITLE The Universality of Administrative Competencies:
Lessons Learned from the Doctoral Leadership Program
at Seattle University.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
National Conference of Professors of Educational
Administration (35th, Seattle, WA, August 16-21,
1981).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Doctoral Programs; *Educational Administration;
Higher Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership
Training; *Management Development
IDENTIFIERS *Leadership Effectiveness; Seattle University WA;
*Universality

ABSTRACT

Seattle University's three-year doctoral program in educational leadership both teaches and tests the hypothesis that universal behaviors exist which are generic to effective leadership in any organization in any field. Leadership effectiveness research shows that the critical factor lies in appropriately integrating both task-oriented and interpersonal behaviors, work and interaction facilitation, and goal emphasis. In the first summer of the doctoral program the students learn to meet nine core objectives that combine this critical factor with analysis of their own skills and educational organizations and the establishment of positive relationships with the faculty and other students. In the following months the students apply what they have learned to their work situations through a "Leadership Effectiveness and Change Plan." The second year is devoted to carrying out an "Organizational Analysis and Change Plan." In the third year each student continues in a "Personal Growth Plan." Students report back in writing to the faculty throughout the program. This process of study, application, analysis, and reporting constitutes an effective model of leadership training whose results yield further proof of the universality of effective leadership behaviors. (Author/RW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED210812

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Constance Carter
Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

The Universality of Administrative Competencies:
Lessons Learned from the Doctoral Leadership
Program at Seattle University

By: Constance Carter Cooper

August 1981

EA 014 296

The information explosion of the last decades of the Twentieth Century has created a proportionate demand in the market place for highly skilled, and effective organizational leadership. The Seattle University Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is a response to that need which provides a paradigm for both teaching and testing the hypothesis that there is a universality of behaviors which are generic to effective leadership within any organization in any field of endeavor. This theoretical concept of universality provides the structural undergirding for all components of the doctoral program at Seattle University. One assumption underlying the program is that leadership training based on the best possible conceptualizations from research and theory will result in the development of individual's skilled in the art of structuring the expectations of their followers. A prime program objective is to foster the growth of a cadre of proactive rather than reactive leaders.

The concept of leadership has many realities for different people. For purposes of this paper, we are defining leadership as the combination of behaviors performed by individual members of an organization which act to coordinate the efforts of persons of the organization and serve to move the organization toward the attainment of its goals and objectives. A significant body of research exists which identifies specific categories of behaviors as being critical factors in determining the effectiveness of leaders in an organization. According to the data, certain combinations of behaviors in specific situations act to maintain the well-being of the organization while encouraging the members of the organization to cooperatively fulfill organization goals and objectives. These findings have been homogenous between studies of leadership behaviors in the public and private sectors, business and industry, the military, in non-profit agencies and in all types of educational institutions.

The most comprehensive reporting of the published research on leadership to date as found in Ralph M. Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership (1974). The behaviors which emerge from this inventory of research as those most significantly determining leader effectiveness are basically two dimensional whether they are categorized by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research as "Group Maintenance and Task Maintenance" behaviors, by Hersey and Blanchard as "Task Relationship" behaviors, by Blake and Mouton as "Concern for People or Concern for Production," by Herzberg as "behaviors aimed at meeting hygiene or motivating" needs of followers, or as "the structure and consideration" behaviors of the Ohio State Universities' LBDQ and LBDQ-XII Studies. The data indicate that the critical factor in leadership effectiveness is the appropriate integration of both task-oriented and interpersonal behaviors within four categories:

1. Support: behavior toward subordinates that lets them know they are worthwhile persons doing useful work
2. Interaction facilitation: team building, behavior that encourages subordinates to develop close, cooperative working relationships with one another
3. Goal emphasis: behavior that stimulates a contagious enthusiasm for doing a good job
4. Work facilitation: behavior that removes blockages.

(Bowers and Seashore, 1966).

While the totality of competencies which are "a priori" generic to effective leadership cannot be said to have been proven by research, many are generally accepted as truths based on intuition or past experience. The Seattle University Program looks at leadership from a broad perspective, recognizing that what has been learned in business, public administration, psychology, sociology, and education has universal applicability for business and industry, public administration, non-profit agencies, schools and the military. Both the literature and the experiences of the six year old program support the theory that effective leadership in schools is the result of the same behaviors as would be found to be the behaviors of effective

leaders in the U.S. Navy, General Motors Corporation, or the Campfire Girls. These behaviors, which are reflective of a set of learned, general leadership competencies, flow across and between all fields of endeavor demonstrating the universality of administrative tasks and functions.

The Seattle University program specifically aims at the preparation of "educational leadership." For purposes of defining the two key terms "educational leadership," schools are but one small part of the educational process in our technological society and leadership may or may not involve "administration." These distinctions are exemplified by the texts currently used within the "leadership core" of the program. None deal primarily with schools or administration: Stogdill, Hall's Development of Consciousness, Drucker's The Effective Executive, Huse's Organizational Development and Change, and Burns' Leadership.

The breadth of the term "education" as used in the doctoral program is illustrated by the diversity of professional roles held by members of the student body. Graduates and current enrollees include the executive director of a chamber of commerce, the director of an experimental mini-prison, a national Camp Fire Girls Executive, a bank vice president for training, a college dean, a director of training for a hospital, community college instructors and administrators and other personnel. The key descriptive terms include traditional/non-traditional, public/private, formal/informal "education." Each of these is consciously designed into both the curriculum and student body.

Peter Drucker has said, "In human affairs, the distance between leaders and the average is a constant. If leadership performance is high, the average will go up." Drucker's statement addresses the basic purpose of Seattle University's doctoral program which is to improve the education of people in the Pacific Northwest by raising the quality of leadership of those involved in "education."

The program is designed to meet the needs of the broad spectrum of leaders in education through leadership training and skill building based in part on the provision of opportunities for students to put theories related to effective leadership behaviors, organizational development and change, and time management into practice, the 90 quarter credit hour program includes a 27 credit common core, 39 credits in professional education and cognate courses, and 24 units of independent work including internships, independent study, and the dissertation/project option. The twenty-seven hour core of study in Educational Leadership encompasses a three-year period and are completed as a group by each new class of students.

While the core contains substantial academic content, it also includes, by design, activities which develop group identity and mutual support. These additional activities have proven invaluable in preventing dropouts, sustaining morale, and providing students with a peer support system.

The following set of objectives are met by students through the core. Students are able to:

1. Understand the growing body of research relating to leadership.
2. Analyze key aspects of their own leadership characteristics and identify areas needing development.
3. Develop consciousness regarding the relationship between values and leadership.
4. Establish key habits and develop practices which make their leadership increasingly effective.
5. Increase proactive educational leadership based upon awareness and understanding of current times and the developmental needs of individuals served, both within their respective professions and the greater society.
6. Improve their understanding of conflict management theory and develop a model for personal use.
7. Analyze and interpret values operating in their organizations.
8. Develop specific concepts and tentative plans for becoming leaders for change toward the goal of improving educational productivity and enhancing the lives of individuals involved.

9. Establish professional and personal relationships among students and faculty that impact positively on the program and aid students with the work performed throughout their career.

The initial seminar, titled Workshop in Educational Leadership meets for four weeks, 9 - 4 daily from mid-July to mid-August. The content focus is research in leadership, values clarification, professional and social issues, effective leadership practices, and self-assessment. Emphasis is on the individual student within a formal organization.

Joyce and Showers (1980) reported that in order for individuals to incorporate new behavior into their repertoire of skills, they must go through five stages:

1. theory input
2. demonstration/modeling
3. practice
4. feedback in simulated practice condition
5. coaching (on-site)

Beginning with the conclusion of the first summer workshop, students are expected to make formal applications of what has been learned to their respective work situations. This is accomplished through an individual "Leadership Analysis and Change Plan" which is developed during the first summer workshop and implemented on the job during the first year of program participation. Progress reports are made during the year and each student prepares an extensive final report of the "Leadership Analysis and Change Plan" which includes objective data, subjective analyses, details of changes implemented, and other pertinent information. In addition, small groups of students are required to conduct a minimum of four inservice workshops for their respective organizations that concern the processes of becoming effective professionals. Through these workshops students internalize and reinforce habits associated with sound leadership such as time management, building on strengths, recording matters in writing, and goal and priority setting.

A similar process takes place during the second year with the emphasis placed on the organizational activities of leadership. The four week seminar in the second year focuses on the various theories related to organizational change. Each student develops and implements an "Organizational Analysis and Change Plan" in relation to the agency in which the person is employed. Depending on the student's role and interest, these plans have ranged from attempts to improve communications flow within a school to massive restructuring of an organization. Periodic progress reports and a final report are required as the second year of the program progresses. As occurs with the leadership plans developed during the previous year, activities initiated as part of the organizational change plan frequently continue beyond the conclusion of the formal program requirements.

No new basic theme is introduced for the third year and thereafter. However, as long as a student continues in the program a "Professional Growth Plan" is required each year to reinforce the program's themes, especially those of goal prioritization and time and resource allocation as they relate to goal accomplishment.

This process of study, application, analysis, and reporting from and by the students provides an effective model for leadership training based on theory and practice. Theoretical concepts become particularized for practitioner-students through the program requirement that they go out and "do it" for a year in the field followed by a reporting of the relative validity and reliability of the concept as it emerges from their experiences.

Final reports of Leadership Improvement Plans, and the Organization Development Plans have consistently substantiated the programmatic assumptions regarding the applicability of generic administrative competencies to diverse fields of endeavor. The reports of these student-practitioners from business, industry, elementary and secondary schools, and higher education provide an ongoing affirmation of the universality of concepts which originated with the research of people like: Likert 1961, 1967, Argyris, 1962, Katz and

Kahn, 1966, Blake and Mouton, 1964, Taylor and Bowers 1972; Hersey and Blanchard, 1977, Bowers and Franklin 1977 and others such as:

1. the importance of leader structuring of tasks and leader interpersonal relationship skills to organizing performance,
2. the relationship between social-psychological aspects of organizational functioning and organizational output variables,
3. the increasing importance of leader interpersonal relationship skills to the success of organizations as they become both more oriented toward service functions and more technologically advanced, and
4. the effectiveness of individuals is proportionate to the extent to which they have:
 - (a) the information and skills necessary to complete the various tasks
 - (b) values congruent with organizing goals and objectives
 - (c) a situation in which they are supported in their attempts to behave effectively.

Hundreds of Effectiveness Workshop Presentations and Organization Development Plan implementations have taught us that the competencies needed for effective leadership in adapting behaviors, managing people, motivation and communications skills, and time management techniques are the same regardless of the place where practiced. The study of organizational and situational commonalities and differences enables the students to develop evaluation skills needed to enable them to adopt and adapt the variations of behaviors needed for specific conditions and circumstances in the future.¹

The lesson learned at Seattle University is that leadership behavior to be effective must be directed

toward achieving the organization's goals and is influenced by the conditions, policies, procedures, and objectives that constitute the organizational climate no matter what is the product or services provided by the organization and in the words of Stogdill (1974):

Structuring expectations in the single pattern that contributes positively to group productivity, cohesiveness, and satisfaction. This pattern of behavior is perhaps the central factor in leadership since it is intimately associated with the definition of leadership as the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction. Philosophies of leadership and training methods that undermine this factor destroy the very foundation of leadership.

1

For a more complete description of the Seattle University program, see John A. Morford and Frederick John Gies, "Preparing Educational Leaders at the Doctoral Level," in Public Education: Toward Equality, Equity, and Excellence," Cooper, Kanpp, and Patterson Editors, pp.127-138, Kendall-Hunt, 1981

References

Argyris, Chris. Executive Leadership: An Appraisal of a Manager in Action. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, Inc. 1953.

----- "Organizational Leadership," in L. Petrulla and B.M. Bass, eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

----- Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey, 1962.

----- Management and Organizational Development: The Path from XA to YB. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Bennis, Warren G. Organization Development: Its Nature, Origin, and Prospects. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

----- "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV, no.3 (December 1959) 259-301.

Beer, Michael, Robert Buckhout, Milton W. Horowitz, and Seymour Ley, "Some Perceived Properties of the Difference between Leaders and Non-Leaders," The Journal of Psychology, 47 (1959), 49-56.

Blake, Robert R., and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid, Houston, Tex.: Gulf Publishing, 1964.

Bowers, D. G. and J. L. Franklin. Data Based Organizational Change. La Jolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1977.

----- and S. E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness With a Four Factor Theory of Leadership," Administrative Science Quarterly, XI, no.2(1966), 238-63.

Brooks, E., "What Successful Executives Do," Personnel, XXXII, no.3(1955), 210-25.

Carter, Louhor, William Haythorn and Margaret Howell, "A Further Investigation of the Criteria of Leadership," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 45(1950), 350-58.

Drucker, Peter F. The Effective Executive. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Francis, Dave and Don Young. Improving Work Groups. San Diego, Calif.: University Associates, 1979.

Hemphill, John K. Situational Factors in Leadership, Monograph No.32. Columbus: Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1949.

----- and Alvin E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description and Questionnaire," in Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Monograph No.88, Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, eds. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.

Hersey, Paul and Kenneth A. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1977.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and Nature of Man. New York: World Publishing Co., 1966.

Joyce, Bruce R., and Beverly Showers. "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." Educational Leadership 37 (February 1980):379.

Kahn, R.L. and D. Katz, "Leadership Practices in Relation to Productivity and Morale," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (2nd ed.), D. Cartwright and A. Zander, eds., pp.554-71, Evanston, Ill: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960.

Katz, D., and Kahn, R.I. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Korman, A.K., "Consideration 'Initiating Structure,' and Organizational Criteria -- A Review," Personnel Psychology: A Journal of Applied Research, XIX, no.4(1966), 349-61.

Levin, K., R. Lippitt, and R.White, "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three 'Social Climates'" in Group Dynamics: Research and Theory (2nd ed.), Cartwright and Zander, eds., Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1960.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

----- New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

McGregor, Douglas. Leadership and Motivation. Boston: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Morford, John A. and Frederick John Gies, "Preparing Educational Leaders at the Doctoral Level," in Public Education: Toward Equality, Equity and Excellence, Cooper, Knapp, and Patterson ed., Dubuque, Ia.: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company, 1981.

Lelznick, P. Leadership in Administration. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Vroom, V. H. and Phillip Yelton. Leadership and Decision Making. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.